REMARKS

Claims 24-46 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated April 8, 2009, claims 24-46 were rejected.

Claims 24-28 and 30-46 are amended and claims 47-49 are added herein.

Claims 24-49 are pending upon entry of the amendment.

In view of the amendments herein and the remarks that follow, reconsideration of all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdrawal of them, is now requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Now Mooted

In the Office Action, claims 24-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas, U.S. Patent No. 7,366,522. This rejection is traversed in view of the amended claims.

Amended claim 31 recites a method executable by a computer system in a supply chain network, the method comprising:

> receiving, from a site server associated with one or more site data appliances, a document comprising event information that describes events generated by one or more types of data source equipment associated with the one or more site data appliances; and
>
> automatically generating a mapping table based on the received document that maps each event of the one or more types of data source equipment as described in the event information to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Thomas. First, Thomas does not disclose "receiving, from a site server associated with one or more site data appliances, a document comprising event information that describes events

generated by one or more types of data source equipment associated with the one or more site data appliances."

Thomas discloses a location monitoring system that allows only authorized users to obtain access to locations of objects being monitored via a mobile computing device associated with each object. *See* Thomas, Abstract. When an authorized user wants to locate an object being tracked, the location monitoring server retrieves location information (e.g., FIG. 5B) associated with the object from a location database. *See* Thomas, col. 7, ll. 12-14. The location monitoring server then creates a location page using the retrieved information into a suitable format that can be delivered to the requesting viewer. *See* Thomas, col. 15-18.

Thomas' location page is not a corollary to the "document," as currently claimed. As mentioned above, Thomas discloses that the location page represents the formatting of location information associated with mobile units that is described in the location table shown in FIG. 5B. *See* Thomas, col. 7, ll. 15-18 and col. 3, ll. 1-3. That is, the location page describes the locations of the mobile units. In contrast, the claimed "document" comprises "event information that describes events generated by one or more types of data source equipment associated with the one or more site data appliances."

Second, Thomas does not disclose "automatically generating a mapping table based on the received document…" The Office Action asserts that Thomas' authorization table and location table, respectively shown in FIGs. 5A and 5B, could correspond to the "mapping table." Assuming for the sake of argument that Thomas' location page could correspond to the claimed "document," under this interpretation Thomas discloses generating the location page from the location tables shown in FIGs. 5A and 5B since Thomas explicitly states that a "location can be retrieved from the location database" (i.e., from the location table stored in

the location database) and "[t]hen, a location page using the retrieved information can be formed." *See* Thomas, col. 7, ll. 12-15. In other words, Thomas discloses generating the location page based on the location tables (i.e., the alleged "mapping table"). Thus, Thomas performs steps that are reversed from those performed by the claimed invention. In the claimed invention, the mapping table is automatically generated based on the received document.

Third, Thomas' authorization table shown in FIG. 5A and the location table shown in FIG. 5B also do not correspond to the claimed "mapping table" because both the authorization table and the location table do not map "each event of the one or more types of data source equipment…to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment," as claimed. As shown in FIG. 5A, the authorization table simply illustrates a mobile device being monitored, a user associated with the mobile device, a person monitoring the device, and the person's password and login information. *See* Thomas, col. 6, ll. 38-43. Nowhere in FIG. 5A does Thomas disclose the mapping of an "event" to an "event handler that executes in response to an event" being generated.

The location table shown in FIG. 5B merely illustrates the current location and the previous location of each mobile device. *See* Thomas, col. 6, ll. 44-52. Similar to the authorization table, the location table does not illustrate the mapping of an "event" to an "event handler that executes in response to an event" being generated. Thus, Thomas' authorization table and location table clearly are both not an equivalent to the claimed "mapping table."

Nor could Thomas' tables correspond to the claimed "document" and nor could the location page correspond to the claimed "mapping table." As described above, Thomas' location page is simply a formatted representation of the location table shown in FIG. 5B. An example of a HTML location page, using the information from FIG. 5B, may include a statement that mobile device 1 is currently located at "XXX" and its previous location was at "YYY." Clearly, a location page that includes a geographic location of a mobile device is not the equivalent to a mapping table that maps "each event of the one or more types of data source equipment…to a corresponding event handler that executes in response to an event generated by the one or more types of data source equipment."

Thus, for at least the reasons noted above, claim 31 is patentably distinguishable over Thomas.

The Office Action rejected claims 24, 38-39, and 46 for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 31 with respect to Thomas. *See* Office Action, p. 5. Claims 24, 38-39, and 46 include similar limitations as those of claim 31. Thus, claims 24, 38-39, and 46 are patentably distinguishable over Thomas for similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31.

Dependent claims 25-30, 32-37, 40-45, and 47-49 incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims. Applicants submit that claims 25-30, 32-37, 40-45, and 47-49 are allowable for at least the reasons described above with respect to the independent claims in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-49 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference and are in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 27, 2010

By: /Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo/
Agent for Assignee
Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo, Reg. No. 65,328
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7820
Fax: (650) 938-5200